IBM CORPORATION

	NTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPA	ARTMENT		. 1	
	11400 BURNET ROAD				ij
	AUSTIN, TEXAS 78758	į.			1
	FAX # 512		·		
-1	or la	į.	,		
DATE: OI	01/06				
Minhar of Pages to Follow	w (including cover sheet)				
14mmer of Lages to Louis	w (mending cover super)			1	į
		<u>!</u> :			
SEND TO:	United States Patent Office	: :: ::			
Examiner:	Sara M. Haune	#			į
Group Art Unit:	2179	#			
Tel No:	103-305-07	7 \'2			
Fack #:	571-273-8300		i		: 5
THE T	3-11-215-000				
	_	i.			
FROM:	J.B. KEAFT				
Tel No:	512- 473 - 2303	!' ! :.			1
		∰ -:			
		: [
ADDRESSED, AND MAY CO	d only for the use of the individual (ntain information that is privileged,	OR ENTITY TO WHI CONFIDENTIAL A	AD EXEM		
SEOW DISCLOSUKE ONDER	APPLICABLE LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS	Message is not	THE ING	四甲甲	Ď.
INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU	YEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVER: ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEM	ING THE MESSAGE INATION, DISTRIB	TO THE		
COPYING OF THIS COMMUN	ICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU	HAVE RECEIVED	this '	1 .3	
ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US	R. PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TE AT THE ADDRESS ABOVE VIA THE U.S. POST	LEPHONE AND RET	TURN TH		
			NK YOU		- 1
					- 2
Docket Nd. 1059 2001 090	07 USI Serial No. 10/047, 116 Atty:				2
Docket No. Ausg 2001 090 Applicants C. H. (Ullmaun et al	J.B.KRAFT			
Docket Nd. 1059 2001 090 Applicants. C. U. (Certificate of Facs	J.B.KRAFT			
Docket No. Ausg 2001 090 Applicants. C. H. (Certificate of Facs	J.B.KRAFT			
Docket No. 1059 2001 090 Applicants. C. U. (Certificate of Facs ment Notice of Appeal	J.B.K.RAFT			
Docket No. 1092 2001 090 Applicants C. U. (Transmittal Letter (2 Preliminary Amenda Amendment AF	Certificate of Facs ment Notice of Appeal	J.B.K.RAFT			
Docket No. 1092 2001 090 Applicants. C. H. (Transmittal Letter (2 Preliminary Amenda Amendment AF Ext. of Time	Certificate of Facs ment Notice of Appeal Appeal Brief (3 co	JBKRAFT imile pies) BEST			
Docket No. 109 200(090 Applicants C. H. (Transmittal Letter (2 Preliminary Amenda Amendment AF Ext. of Time 1138 Statement	Certificate of Facs ment Notice of Appeal	JBKRAFT imile pies) BEST			
Docket No. 1092 2001 090 Applicants. C. H. (Transmittal Letter (2 Preliminary Amenda Amendment AF Ext. of Time	Certificate of Facs ment Notice of Appeal Appeal Brief (3 co	JBKRAFT imile pies) BEST			a distributed of the second of
Docket No. 109 2001 090 Applicant: C. H. (Transmittal Letter (2 Preliminary Amenda Amendment AF Ext. of Time IDS Statement	Certificate of Facs ment Notice of Appeal Appeal Brief (3 co	JBKRAFT imile pies) BEST			and the second of the second o
Docket No. 109 200(090 Applicants C. H. (Transmittal Letter (2 Preliminary Amenda Amendment AF Ext. of Time 1138 Statement	Certificate of Facs ment Notice of Appeal Appeal Brief (3 co Reply Brief 3 co Change of Address	JBKRAFT imile pies) BEST			y and a second of the second o
Docket No. 109 200(090 Applicants. C. H. (Transmittal Letter (2 Preliminary Amenda Amendment AF Ext. of Time IDS Statement	Certificate of Facs ment Notice of Appeal Appeal Brief (3 co	JBKRAFT imile pies) BEST			s and a second of the second o

PAGE 1/16 * RCVD AT 1/2/2006 1:32:10 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:512 473 8803 * DURATION (mm-ss):14-32

RECEIVED CENTER

JAN 0 2 2006

PATENT 10/047,116

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Group Art Unit: 2179

Examiner: Sara M. Hanne

dristi N. Ullmann et al.

Intellectual Property

Serial No: 10/047,116

Law Department - 4054

Filed: 01/15/2002

International Busidess

Title: A SYSTEM FOR

: Machines Corporation

RECORDING WORLD WIDE WEB

11400 Burnet Road

BROWSING SESSIONS NAVIGATION

Austin, Texas 78758

ON A REAL-TIME BASIS AND FOR :

Customer No. 32,329

SUBSEQUENTLY DISPLAYING THE

RECORDED SESSIONS AS

SURROGATE BROWSING SESSIONS

WITH USER ENABLED REAL-TIME

MODIFICATION

Dated:

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence including the present Reply Brief (in triplicate) is being transmitted via facsimile to USPTO. Group Art Unit 2179 at telephone number 571-273-8300, and to the attention of Examiner Sara M. Hanne

REPLY BRIEF ON APPEAL
BEFORE THE BOARD OF APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Commissioner for Patents P.O.Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

WS920010907US1

This is a Reply Brief to the Examiner's Answer mailed November 2, 2005.

In the Answer, the Examiner makes one new argument and cites specific sections in a modifying reference, Scherphier (US5,944,791) which Applicants need to address.

However, before proceeding further, Applicants wish to again summarize the claimed invention, and the differences from the teaching of the basic Rust patent.

According to both Rust and the present invention, the browsing sessions are recorded on a real time basis and may played back at the same pace as recorded or at a different bace. However, the present invention differs from the teaching of Rust in one major aspect: hyperlinks which were recorded and saved but never selected or clicked on during the original recorded browsing sessions are available and may be subsequently interactively selected by the subsequent user during the playback sessions to access and display the linked Web document.

There is nothing in the Rust teaching which suggests that during a subsequent playback session, there can be an interactive selecting of an unselected unused hyperlink from the previously recorded web browsing session to thereby access the linked hypertext (Web) document. The Examiner admits that Rust explicitly fails to set forth "the subsequent user selecting a recorded but previously unselected hyperlink" (commencing with last full sentence on page 3 of final rejection). The Examiner who has failed to find anything in Rust suggestive of this inventive point, goes on to argue merely that whether or not a hyperlink is previously selected or unselected is of little consequence to the subsequent user.

The Examiner concludes that it would have been dovious to one skilled in the art to select in a subsequent playback AUS920010907US1

PAGE 3/16 * RCVD AT 1/2/2006 1:32:10 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:512 473 8803 * DURATION (mm-ss):14-32

previously unselected hyperlink. What the Examiner has ignored is that in Rust, there is no embodiment which would permit a user to interactively click on or select a previously unselected hyperlink. The whole purpose of Rus is to present to subsequent viewers, a playback of the recorded collaborative Web browsing session which is not interactive i.e. the viewer can not select an unselected hyperlink by pointing and clicking. Reference is made to the primary Fig. 1A in Rust, in which the collaborative Web prowsing session is interactively created by presenter and attendee clients, then correlated and recorded with the audio and visual components of the collaborative web drowsing session at control server 140. Then, it is made available for subsequent playback to the Playback Client The stated purpose of Rust, (lines 42-52), column 2, is to provide a means of briefing a future or absentee customer (Playback Client 150) of the presentation of a collaborative browsing session, and not to provide to provide the customer with the interactive means for subsequently participating in the session,

In the Answer, the Examiner argues that it is known that individual Web documents may be recorded with active hyperlinks therein. With such a non-specific vague general statement, it is difficult for Applicants to respond to how this could suggest a modification in the fixed playback with integrated recorded audio and visual components provide in Rust to future Playback Client 150.

In this connection, Examiner makes an argument in the Answer involving the Scherphier Patent (US5.944,791) cross referenced in Rust. In Scherphier, there is described a collaborative Web browsing session, in which the controlling computer, which chooses the hyperlinks, is represented as the "Filot Computer", and the other computers in the session as the "Filot Computer", and the other computers in the session are presented as the "Filot Computer", and the other computers in the session are presented as the "Filot Computer", and the other computers in the session are presented as the presented as the presented as the "Filot Computer", and the other computers in the session are presented as the p

PAGE 4/16 * RCVD AT 1/2/2006 1:32:10 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SYR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:512 473 8803 * DURATION (mm-ss):14-32

provision in Scherphier for promoting a Passenger Computer to a Co-Pilot Computer which can now chose hyperlinks in web pages in the browsing session. Examiner feels that this would somehow suggest that Rust's Playback Client 150 could also be given such a function.

Applicants submit that the Passenger Computer in Scherphier promoted to Co-Pilot is not a subsequent viewer of the recorded collaborative browsing session. The Co-Pilot computer is only a participant in the on-going collaborative session which is promoted so that the Co-Pilot could now also control the ongoing collaborative browsing session.

Ther is one last point in the Answer which Applicants heed to address. In the middle paragraph on page 8 of the Answer, Examiner argues that Applicants can not incorporate their "Later Link Log" embodiment example into the claims in order to establish patentability over the cited prior art. This is not Applicants intention. The present claims stand on their own as unobvious over the prior art.

The purpose of Applicants' citing of their "Later Link"
Log" embodiment was to show that unlike the present
invention, the Rust reference is completely lacking in any
embodiment or suggestion of how hyperlinks could be
preserved as active in subsequent play back of recorded Web
browsing sessions.

AU8920010907US1

Accordingly, for the above reasons and for the reasons et forth in the Brief on Appeal, it is respectfully requested that the Final Rejection be reversed, and that claims 1-28, all of the claims in the present patent application be found to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted

ttorney for Applicants Registration No. 19,226

(512) 473-2303

PLEASE MAIL ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Mark Walker IPLaw Dept. - IMAD 4054 IBM Corporation 11400 Burnet Road Austin, Texas 78758

AUS920010907US1

9

PAGE 6/16 * RCVD AT 1/2/2006 1:32:10 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:512 473 8803 * DURATION (mm-ss):14-32

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 02 2006

PATENT 10/047,116

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Group Art Unit: 2179

Cristi N. Ullmann et al.

Examiner: Sara M. Hanne

Serial No: 10/047,116

Intellectual Property

Filed: 01/15/2002

Law Department - 4054

生工tle:

International Business

A SYSTEM FOR RECORDING WORLD WIDE WEB

Machines Corporation

BROWSING SESSIONS NAVIGATION

11400 Burnet Road

ON A REAL-TIME BASIS AND FOR

Austin, Texas 78758

SUBSEQUENTLY DISPLAYING THE

Customer No. 32,32\$

RECORDED SESSIONS AS

SURROGATE BROWSING SESSIONS

WITH USER ENABLED REAL-TIME

MODIFICATION

Dated:

IFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence including the resent Reply Brief (in triplicate) is being transmitted vi csimile to USPTO, Group Art Unit 2179 at telephone number and to the attention of Examiner Sara M. Hann

> REPLY BRIEF ON APPEAL BEFORE THE BOARD OF APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

punistioner for Patents . ₽. Bo \$ 1450 xandria, VA 22313-1450

Ψ\$920010907US1

· 1

AGE 7/16 * RCVD AT 1/2/2006 1:32:10 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:512 473 8803 * DURATION (mm-ss):14-32

This is a Reply Brief to the Examiner's Answer mailed Movember 2, 2005

In the Answer, the Examiner makes one new argument and cites specific sections in a modifying reference, Scherphier (US5,944,791) which Applicants need to address.

However, before proceeding further, Applicants wish to again summarize the claimed invention, and the differences from the teaching of the basic Rust patent.

According to both Rust and the present invention, the browsing sessions are recorded on a real time basis and may played back at the same pace as recorded or at a different pace. However, the present invention differs from the teaching of Rust in one major aspect: hyperlinks which were recorded and saved but never selected or clicked on during the original recorded browsing sessions are available and may be subsequently interactively selected by the subsequent user during the playback sessions to access and display the linked Web document.

There is nothing in the Rust teaching which suggests that during a subsequent playback session, there can be an interactive selecting of an unselected unused hyperlink from the previously recorded Web browsing session to thereby access the linked hypertext (Web) document. The Examiner admits that Rust explicitly fails to set forth "the subsequent user selecting a recorded but previously unselected hyperlink" (commencing with last full sentence of the sentence of the subsequent in Rust suggestive of this inventive point, goes on to argue merely that whether or not a hyperlink is previously selected or unselected is of little consequence to the subsequent user.

The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to select in a subsequent playback AUS920010907US1

PAGE 8/16 * RCVD AT 1/2/2006 1:32:10 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:512 473 8803 * DURATION (mm-ss):14-32

a previously unselected hyperlink. What the Examiner has Ignored is that in Rust, there is no embodiment which would permit a user to interactively click on or select a previously unselected hyperlink. The whole purpose of Rust is to present to subsequent viewers, a playback of the recorded collaborative Web browsing session which is not interactive i.e. the viewer can not select an unselected hyperlink by pointing and clicking. Reference is made to the primary Fig. 1A in Rust, in which the collaborative Web prowsing session is interactively created by presenter and attendee clients, then correlated and recorded with the dudio and visual components of the collaborative web drowsing session at control server 140. Then, it is made available for subsequent playback to the Playback Client 150. The stated purpose of Rust. (lines 42-52), column 2, is to provide a means of briefing a future or absentee customer (Playback Client 150) of the presentation of a collaborative browsing session, and not to provide to provide the customer with the interactive means for subsequently participating in the session,

In the Answer, the Examiner argues that it is known that individual Web documents may be recorded with active hyperlinks therein. With such a non-specific vague general statement, it is difficult for Applicants to respond to how this could suggest a modification in the fixed playback with integrated recorded audio and visual components provide in Rust to future Playback Client 150.

In this connection, Examiner makes an argument in the Arswer involving the Scherphier Patent (US5,944,791), cross referenced in Rust. In Scherphier, there is described a collaborative Web browsing session, in which the controlling demputer, which chooses the hyperlinks, is represented as the "Plot Computer", and the other computers in the session AUS920010907HS1

PAGE 9/16 * RCVD AT 1/2/2006 1:32:10 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SYR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:512 473 8803 * DURATION (mm-ss):14-32

as "Passenger Computers". Examiner notes that there is provision in Scherphier for promoting a Passenger Computer to a Co-Pilot Computer which can now chose hyperlinks in wat pages in the browsing session. Examiner feels that this would somehow suggest that Rust's Playback Client 150 could also be given such a function.

JB.KRAFT

Applicants submit that the Passenger Computer in Scherphier promoted to Co-Pilot is not a subsequent viewer of the recorded collaborative browsing session. pilot computer is only a participant in the on-going collaborative session which is promoted so that the co-pilot could now also control the ongoing collaborative browsing session.

Ther is one last point in the Answer which Applicants need to address. In the middle paragraph on page 8 of the Answer, Examiner argues that Applicants can not incorporate their "Later Link Log" embodiment example into the claims in order to establish patentability over the cited prior art. This is not Applicants intention. The present claims stand on their own as unobvious over the prior art.

The purpose of Applicants' citing of their "Later Link Log" embodiment was to show that unlike the present invention, the Rust reference is completely lacking in any embodiment or suggestion of how hyperlinks could be, preserved as active in subsequent play back of recorded web bibwsing sessions.

AU\$920**0**10907US1

Accordingly, for the above reasons and for the reasons et forth in the Brief on Appeal, it is respectfully requested that the Final Rejection be reversed, and that claims 1-28, all of the claims in the present patent application be found to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted

ttorney for Applicants egistration No. 19,226

(512) 473-2303

PLEASE MAIL ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Mark Walker IPLaw Dept. - IMAD 4054 IBM Corporation 11400 Burnet Road Austin, Texas 78758

AU8920010907US1

5

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 0 2 2006

PATENT 10/047,116

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Group Art Unit: 2179

Cristi N. Ullmann et al.

Examiner: Sara M. Hanne

Serial No: 10/047,116

Intellectual Property

Law Department - 4054

Filed: 01/15/2002 Title:

International Business

A SYSTEM FOR RECORDING WORLD WIDE WEB

Machines Corporation

BROWSING SESSIONS NAVIGATION

11400 Burnet Road Austin, Texas 78758

ON A REAL-TIME BASIS AND FOR

Customer No. 32,329

SUBSEQUENTLY DISPLAYING THE

RECORDED SESSIONS AS

SURROGATE BROWSING SESSIONS

WITH USER ENABLED REAL-TIME

MODIFICATION

Dated:

TIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

hereby certify that this correspondence including th present Reply Brief (in triplicate) is being transmitted via to the attention of Examiner Sara M. Hanne

> BRIEF ON APPEAL THE BOARD OF APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

ddmmissioner for Patents D.Bok 1450 exandria, VA 22313-1450

BEST AVAILABLE

920010907051

This is a Reply Brief to the Examiner's Answer mailed

In the Answer, the Examiner makes one new argument and cites specific sections in a modifying reference, Scherphier (US5,944,791) which Applicants need to address.

However, before proceeding further, Applicants wish to again summarize the claimed invention, and the differences from the teaching of the basic Rust patent.

According to both Rust and the present invention, the browsing sessions are recorded on a real time basis and may played back at the same pace as recorded or at a different pace. However, the present invention differs from the teaching of Rust in one major aspect: hyperlinks which were recorded and saved but never selected or clicked on during the original recorded browsing sessions are available and may be subsequently interactively selected by the subsequent liker during the playback sessions to access and display the linked Web document.

There is nothing in the Rust teaching which auggests that during a subsequent playback session, there can be an interactive selecting of an unselected unused hyperlink from the previously recorded Web browsing session to thereby access the linked hypertext (Web) document. The Examiner admits that Rust explicitly fails to set forth "the subsequent user selecting a recorded but previously unselected hyperlink" (commencing with last full sentence on page 3 of final rejection). The Examiner who has failed to find anything in Rust suggestive of this inventive point, so on to argue merely that whether or not a hyperlink is previously selected or unselected is of little consequence to the subsequent user.

The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to select in a subsequent playback

previously unselected hyperlink. What the Examiner has gnored is that in Rust, there is no embodiment which would permit a user to interactively click on or select a previously unselected hyperlink. The whole purpose of Rusk is to present to subsequent viewers, a playback of the recorded collaborative Web browsing session which is not interactive i.e. the viewer can not select an unselected syperlink by pointing and clicking. Reference is made to the primary Fig. 1A in Rust, in which the collaborative we prowsing session is interactively created by presenter and attendee clients, then correlated and recorded with the dudio and visual components of the collaborative web prowsing session at control server 140. Then, it is made available for subsequent playback to the Playback Client 150. The stated purpose of Rust, (lines 42-52), column 2, is to provide a means of briefing a future or absentee customer (Playback Client 150) of the presentation of a collaborative browsing session, and not to provide to provide the customer with the interactive means for subsequently participating in the session,

In the Answer, the Examiner argues that it is known that individual Web documents may be recorded with active hyperlinks therein. With such a non-specific vague general statement, it is difficult for Applicants to respond to how this dould suggest a modification in the fixed playback with integrated recorded audio and visual components provide in Rest to future Playback Client 150.

In this connection, Examiner makes an argument in the Answer involving the Scherphier Patent (US5,944,791), cross referenced in Rust. In Scherphier, there is described a collaborative Web browsing session, in which the controlling computer, which chooses the hyperlinks, is represented as the 'Pilot Computer', and the other computers in the session AUS920010907US1

as "Passenger Computers". Examiner notes that there is provision in Scherphier for promoting a Passenger Computer to a Co-Pilot Computer which can now chose hyperlinks in we pages in the browsing session. Examiner feels that this would somehow suggest that Rust's Playback Client 150 could also be given such a function.

Applicants submit that the Passenger Computer in Scherphier promoted to Co-Pilot is not a subsequent viewer of the recorded collaborative browsing session. The Co-Pilot computer is only a participant in the on-going collaborative session which is promoted so that the Co-Pilot could now also control the ongoing collaborative browsing session.

Ther is one last point in the Answer which Applicants need to address. In the middle paragraph on page 8 of the Answer, Examiner argues that Applicants can not incorporate their "Later Link Log" embodiment example into the claims in order to establish patentability over the cited prior art. This is not Applicants intention. The present claims stand on their own as unobvious over the prior art.

The purpose of Applicants' citing of their "Later Link"
Log" embodiment was to show that unlike the present
invention, the Rust reference is completely lacking in any
embodiment or suggestion of how hyperlinks could be
preserved as active in subsequent play back of recorded Web
browsing sessions.

AUS920010907US1

Accordingly, for the above reasons and for the reasons set forth in the Brief on Appeal, it is respectfully requested that the Final Rejection be reversed, and that claims 1-28, all of the claims in the present patent application be found to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted

Attorney for Applicants degistration No. 19,226

512) 473-2303

SLEASE MAIL ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Mark Walker
IPLaw Dept. - IMAD 4054
IBM Corporation
11400 Burnet Road
Austin, Texas 78758

AUS920010907US1

5